

REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation that, in the Final Office Action dated January 25, 2006, claims 31 and 32 were allowed. However, claims 26-29 were withdrawn from consideration as alleged being directed to a non-elected invention. Furthermore, claims 1, 9-25 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0207487 A1 ("Monroe"), U.S. Patent No. 6,057,878 ("Ogiwara et al."), U.S. Patent No. 6,445,814 B1 ("Iijima et al."), U.S. Patent No. 6,323,858 ("Gilbert et al."), U.S. Patent No. 6,498,620 B2 ("Schofield et al."), U.S. Patent No. 6,023,588 ("Ray et al.") and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,335,754 B1 ("Endo et al.").

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 1 and 9-30, and added new claims 33-42. The new claims 33-37 correspond to the original claims 2-4 and 7-8, respectively. The new claims 38-42 correspond to the original claims 2-5 and 7, respectively. Each of the new claims 33-42 depends on one of the allowed independent claims 31 and 32. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request a notice of allowance for the pending claims 31-44.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee et al.

Date: May 24, 2006

By: Thomas H. Ham
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300